REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The arguments presented herein incorporate the arguments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during the phone interviews on June 11, 2007. Applicants submit that the arguments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. Applicants further present herein additional arguments and amendments to further distinguish the claims over the cited art. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 21-40 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 21-40 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Weber (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,901) in view of Ramberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,857,013). Applicants traverse for the following reasons.

Amended claim 1 recites a system in communication with a network comprising one or more network components including one or more storage devices, one or more hosts, and at least one switching fabric. Claim 1 requires: obtaining information on the network components from the manager; maintaining a rules file having at least one rule for each of the network components, wherein each rule identifies the network component to be managed, one of a plurality of communication interface types, and a parameter name, wherein the parameter name is used with the communication interface type to invoke the identifying application process residing on the network component; displaying information representing the network components; receiving selection of one displayed network component; accessing the rules file to determine at least one application process associated with the selected network component; displaying information on the at least one determined application process residing on ~~with~~ the selected network component, wherein at least one of the determined application processes reside on the selected network component; receiving selection of one of the displayed application processes residing on the selected network component; accessing the rule from the rules file for the selected application process to determine information on the selected application process and the communication interface type and parameter name supported by the application process to use to launch the selected application process on the selected network component; and launching

the selected application process on the selected network component using the determined communication interface type and parameter name from the rules file.

Applicants amended claim 1 to require that the rules file have at least one rule for each of the network components, wherein each rule identifies the network component to be managed, one of a plurality of communication interface types, and a parameter name, wherein the parameter name is used with the communication interface type to invoke the application process residing on the network component. Applicants further amended the second "accessing the rules file" limitation to recite accessing the rule from the rules file for the selected application process to determine information on the selected application process and the communication interface type and parameter name supported by the application process to use to launch the selected application process on the selected network component. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pgs. 175, 178-79 and 182-185 of the Specification.

The Examiner cited Weber as teaching executing the application process specific to the device, but did not teach a rules file. However, the Examiner said there must be a file to identify the application processes specific to the managed device. (Fifth Office Action, pg. 6) Weber does mention using information to match a particular device 204 with the management application 24 residing in the repository. The management application is executed on the management workstation and then performs necessary functionality to manage, monitor and configure the particular device. Each management interface application program is configured to communicate with and direct the controller of the associated remote device. (Weber, col. 7, lines 20-40).

Applicants submit that nowhere does the cited Weber anywhere teach or suggest a rules file having at least one rule for each of the network components, wherein each rule identifies the network component to be managed, one of a plurality of communication interface types, and a parameter name, wherein the parameter name is used with the communication interface type to invoke the application process residing on the network component. Instead, the cited Weber discusses how one may determine a management application for a device to run on the management workstation to use to manage the device.

The examiner cited various sections of Ramberg with respect to this rules file requirement, including col. 22, lines 6-40, col. 2, lines 25-65, col. 8, lines 40-56, col. 9, line 40 to

col. 10, line 3, col. 14, lines 50-65, and col.25, lines 5-67. (Fifth Office Action, pgs. 6-7). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited col. 22 mentions that the ADC system can work with different protocols, like XML and HTML to correct and diagnose an ADC device platform. The cited col. 2 mentions that each ADC platform has a communication device that connects to a network to allow remote access by a service technician. The service technicians system uses diagnostic programs contained in HTML documents to perform diagnostic queries on the ADC device platforms, using a protocol like SNMP. The cited col. 8 mentions that the service technician may remotely service the ADC platform. The further cited sections also discuss how a technician may remotely diagnose and monitor an ADC device.

Eleven if Ramberg discusses files to use to monitor and diagnose a remote system and Weber discusses files to associate management applications to invoke locally on the management workstation to communicate with the remote device, nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of a rules file having a rule for each network component to be managed including one of a plurality of communication interface types and a parameter name. Further, although Weber discusses how to determine a management application to run on a management workstation to monitor and manage a remote device, nowhere is there a disclose of a rule indicating a parameter name and communication interface type used to invoke the application process residing on the network component.

Other limitations of the claims are also not taught in the cited art. For instance, the Examiner cited col. 16, line 51 to col. 17, line 51 of Weber as teaching the claim requirement of receiving selection of one of the displayed application processes residing on the selected network component (Fifth Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 16, line 51 to col. 17, line 51 of Weber discusses how upon discovering a list of devices, to start a management interface application, the user preferably double clicks on a storage system and the device property information about the selected storage system is received. The device properties include the storage system's management interface version and the management interface application program version. The management interface application program is loaded on the management station and then may be used to change the configuration of one of the devices.

The cited cols. 16-17 does not teach receiving selection of a displayed application process residing on the selected network component. Instead, the cited cols. 16-17 discuss how a user selects (double clicks) on a device and receives properties that include a management interface application that is loaded on the management workstation to change the configuration of the device. The cited management interface application is not an application process on the selected network component that the user may invoke using the communication interface type and parameter name in the rules file. Instead, the cited management interface application is a program that is locally run to control the remote device.

The Examiner cited col. 13, lines 1-49 col. 7, lines 25-39; col. 16, lines 58-67 of Weber with respect to the pre-amended launching the application process limitation (Fifth Office Action, pg. 6). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended limitation, which now recites launching the selected application process on the selected network component using the determined communication interface from the rules file.

The cited col. 13 discusses a discover-monitor application screen having a management domain window presenting a tree view of the management domain. Lower level nodes in the tree represent actually physical hardware devices such as servers, arrays, and other I/O devices. The higher level nodes in the tree represent the location of the hardware devices, such as state and city. A detailed information window presents detailed properties for each device. If a device is selected, the device's management interface application program is launched. The cited col. 13 discusses a display of hardware devices in the network and their properties. The cited col. 16 discusses starting a management interface application for a storage system in the network by the user clicking one of the storage systems. The device property information about the selected storage system is received. The cited col. 7 discusses how the management application for the device communicates with the controller and control software of the device.

Nowhere do the cited cols. 7, 13, and 16 anywhere teach or suggest the claim requirement of launching the selected application process on the selected network component using the determined communication interface type and parameter name from the rules file. Instead, the cited Weber discusses how to launch a management application interface on the local management workstation to manage, monitor and configure the device on the network. There is no teaching of using a communication interface type and parameter name to launch a selected application process on the selected network component as claimed.

In the Fifth Office Action, the Examiner stated that "[i]nformation regarding the device specification management application, i.e., application process, as in Weber is retrieved from a storage which when selected, launches and effects the execution of the control software residing in the network component enabling the administrator to manage the device". (Fifth Office Action, pg. 10) Applicants submit that Weber discusses how to determine a management application to run locally to control software on a remote device. This does not teach or suggest the claim requirement of using a communication interface type and a parameter name to invoke an application residing on the network component. Weber does not use information on the device to invoke an application residing on the network, but instead uses the information to invoke a management application to communicate with the remote device and application.

Further, the claims require two levels of selection, one of the displayed network component and another of one application process associated with the network component. The cited Weber discusses that when a device node is selected, the device's management interface application is launched (Weber, col. 13, lines 44-50). This does not teach or suggest, first selecting a device and then displaying application processes residing on the network component, and then receiving selection of one displayed application process on the network component. Instead, the cited Weber discusses receiving selection of a device and then going straight to launching on the management workstation the management application interface for that device.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the cite art because the cited combination of Weber and Ramberg do not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2, 4-9, and 38-40 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 1.

Applicants amended independent claims 21, 24, and 31 to substantially include the amendments made to claim 1. Applicants submit that independent claims 21, 24, and 31 are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed with respect to amended claim 1.

Claims 22, 23; 25-30, and 32-36 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of the independent claims 21, 24, and 31.

2. New Claims 41-48 are Patentable over the Cited Art

Added claims 41, 43, 45, and 47 depend from claims 1, 21, 24, and 31, respectively, and further require that the parameter name comprises an address used to communicate with the

network component to invoke the application process. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pgs. 182-184 of the Specification.

Added claims 42, 44, 46, and 48 depend from claims 1, 21, 24, and 31, respectively, and further require that the parameter name comprises an executable name of the application process residing on the network component. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pg. 185 of the Specification.

Applicants submit that claims 41-4 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 21, 24, and 31, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 21-48 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit herewith the fee for the added claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: June 13, 2007

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984